APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/524,377	03/18/2005	Timothy Michael Cusack	102792-033(10997P3)	4717	
27389 7590 08/23/2007 NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS			EXAMINER		
875 THIRD A	03/18/2005 Timothy Michael Cusack 102792-033(1590 08/23/2007 AUGHLIN & MARCUS E Y 10022 MAIL DA	DELCOTTO,	LCOTTO, GREGORY R		
18TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			1751		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/524,377	CUSACK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Gregory R. Del Cotto	1751			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was railure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH: cause the application to become ABAN	TION. be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.	•			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19,21,23-25,27,29,31,32,34,37-39 at 4a</u>) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> are subject to	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance ion is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) fail Date mal Patent Application			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims subject to restriction and/or election requirement are 1-19,21,23-25,27,29,31,32,34,37-39 and 158-164.

Application/Control Number: 10/524,377

Art Unit: 1751

DETAILED ACTION

1. The preliminary amendment filed 2/11/05 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-19, 21, 23-25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-164 drawn to a composition.

Group II, claim(s) 165 and 166, drawn to a process for treating a surface.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Claim 1, at least, is anticipated or obvious over WO02/28180. Consequently, the special technical feature which links 1-19, 21, 23-25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-166, a composition containing an organic acid, a surfactant, polymer, and water, does not provide a contribution over the prior art, so unity of invention is lacking.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- 1. Embodiments wherein the polymer corresponds to group (1).
- 2. Embodiments wherein the polymer is vinylpyrrolidone/vinyl acetate copolymer.

3. Embodiments wherein the polymer is vinylpyrrolidone/vinyl caprolactam/ammonium derivative.

- 4. Embodiments wherein the polymer is poly(vinylpyrrolidone).
- 5. Embodiments wherein the polymer is vinyl pyrrolidone/vinyl caprolactam copolymer.
- 6. Embodiments wherein the polymer is vinyl pyrrolidone/acrylic acid or methacrylic acid copolymers.
- 7. Embodiments wherein the polymer is a copolymer of monomer A and monomber B.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

- 1. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-166.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 10, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-166.

Application/Control Number: 10/524,377

Art Unit: 1751

- 3. Claims 1-3, 11, 12, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-166.
- 4. Claims 1-3, 13, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-166.
- 5. Claims 1-3, 14, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-166.
- 6. Claims 1-3, 15, 16, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-166.
- 7. Claims 1-3, 17-19, 21, 23-25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 37-39, and 158-166.

The following claim(s) are generic: None.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Pursuant to PCT Rule 13.2 and PCT Administrative Instructions, Annex B, Part 1(f)(I)(B)(2), the species are not art recognized equivalents.

A telephone call was made to Andrew Parfomak on August 14, 2007, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of

Art Unit: 1751

record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

Art Unit: 1751

§ 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gregory R. Del Cotto Primary Examiner Art Unit 1751

GRD August 20, 2007